

## REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the Office Action of June 30, 2006 wherein the Examiner: allowed claims 2-4, 7-9, 11 and 12; rejected claims 1, 5, 6, 10, 19 and 20; and objected to claims 13-18.

The Examiner first rejected claims 1, 6, 19 and 20 under 35 USC §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,059,047 to *Schimke*.

Applicant has amended claim 1 to describe the first and second connection configurations being mutually engagable together without the use of tools *or a fastener* by relative sliding movement of the guard with respect to the frame member. According to the invention, as shown in Figure 5, the guard 34 is slid onto the frame member 64. No tools or fasteners are required to install the guard to the frame member.

*Schimke* on the other hand, discloses a seed boot 2 that mounts a sweep 11 using a fastener 12 (Figure 1). The boot 2 is fastened to the cultivator shaft 3 using fasteners 9 (Figure 3). There is no suggestion or teaching in *Schimke* to engage the parts using a sliding engagement without the use of a tool or fasteners.

Applicant has amended claim 6 to describe the first and second connection configurations being hand-engageable together *without the use of a fastener*, by an interlocking connection engaged by relative sliding and rotary movement of the guard with respect to the frame member.

According to the invention, as shown in Figure 5, the guard 34 is slid onto the frame member 64. As shown in Figures 7 and 8, rotary movement of

the guard 34 with respect to the frame member 64 locks the guard 34 to the frame member 64. No tools or fasteners are required to install the guard to the frame member.

*Schimke* on the other hand, discloses a seed boot 2 that mounts a sweep 11 using a fastener 12 (Figure 1). The boot 2 is fastened to the cultivator shaft 3 using fasteners 9 (Figure 3). There is no suggestion or teaching in *Schimke* to interlock the parts using a sliding and rotary movement of the parts without the use of a tool or a fastener.


The Examiner next rejected claims 5 and 10 under 35 USC §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Schimke* alone. Applicant submits that claims 5 and 10 should be allowable based on the asserted allowability of independent claims 1 and 6.

The Examiner next objected to claims 13-18 but indicated the allowance of these claims if rewritten in independent form. Applicant acknowledges this allowance with appreciation. Claims 13-18 should however be allowable based on the asserted allowability of claims 1 and 6.

The Examiner indicated the allowance of claims 2-4, 7-9, 11 and 12. Applicant acknowledges this allowance with appreciation.

Applicant submits that all claims 1-20 are in condition for allowance and requests issuance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

By:   
Randall T. Erickson, Reg. No. 33,872

Attorney Docket No.: 6301P0130US  
The Law Office of Randall T. Erickson, P.C.  
425 W. Wesley St., Suite 1  
Wheaton, IL 60187  
(630) 665-9404  
Customer No. 41528